

Application No. 10/734,811  
Amdt. dated November 10, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated August 15, 2005

### REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting a telephonic Interview on November 10, 2005. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b) and M.P.E.P § 713.04, the substance of that Interview is summarized below.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 17, and 18 are now presented for examination. Claims 1, 6, and 15 are independent. Claims 1, 6, and 15 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention, and claim 17 has been amended so as not to depend on a cancelled claim.

In the Office Action, all the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by WO 01/52106 A2 (*Gal*). In applicant's previous response, dated June 8, 2005, Applicant argued that *Gal* does not teach or suggest sending the multi-event invitation via email, and that instead of using email, *Gal* specifies that the invitation "is dynamically constructed" "when a user goes to the web page for the user's invitations." *Gal* at p. 5, lines 18-20. That argument was based on the common usage of "email" as referring to a specific form of electronic communication, and not to all forms of electronic communication through a computer.

The Office Action relied on a broad definition of email as "electronic communication through a computer" to reject the claims. In order to clarify that the scope of the claims is limited to true email systems (examples include, but are not limited to Yahoo!® mail and Gmail™ by Google®) and does not extend to dynamically generated web pages, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the email invitation is sent to the recipient before an opportunity to access the email invitation is provided to the recipient, and that the email invitation remains unchanged

Application No. 10/734,811  
Amdt. dated November 10, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated August 15, 2005

from the time it is sent until the time when the opportunity to access the email invitation is provided to the recipient. Since this is an inherent characteristic of true email systems that is not shared by dynamically generated web pages, this limitation more clearly distinguishes claim 1 over the dynamically generated web pages taught by *Gal*. Since *Gal* does not teach or suggest sending the multi-event invitation via email, as distinguished above, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over *Gal*.

Claims 6 and 15 have been amended in a corresponding manner, and those claims are therefore believed patentable over the cited art for the same reasons as claim 1. The other claims in this application each depend on one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Rejection is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Rejection is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Application No. 10/734,811  
Amdt. dated November 10, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated August 15, 2005

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW  
UNDER RULE 1.133(b) AND M.P.E.P § 713.04**

On November 10, 2005, Examiner Ouellette and Applicant's undersigned attorney, Robert Mayer, participated in a telephonic Interview. Prior to the Interview (on November 8), Mr. Mayer had faxed a proposed Amendment to Examiner Ouellette; and during the Interview, Mr. Mayer explained how the proposed Amendment to claim 1 clearly distinguishes that claim over WO 01/52106 A2 (*Gal*). More specifically, Mr. Mayer explained that the scope of the claims was originally intended to be limited to true email systems, and acknowledged that if the term "email" was construed in a very broad way to encompass all forms of electronic communication, the old claims would be problematic. After noting that "email" is ordinarily understood to mean a specific form of electronic communication, Mr. Mayer explained that the proposed Amendment describes characteristics of conventional email that are not shared by the dynamically generated web pages taught in *Gal*.

Examiner Ouellette indicated that the proposed Amendment appears to overcome the cited art [i.e., *Gal*], but reserved the right to conduct another search.

Application No. 10/734,811  
Amdt. dated November 10, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated August 15, 2005


Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by telephone at (212) 969-3246 or by facsimile at (212) 969-2900. Please direct all correspondence to Customer No. 21890 at the address provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP

Date: November 10, 2005

By:



Robert S. Mayer  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 38,544

Proskauer Rose LLP  
Patent Department  
1585 Broadway  
New York, NY 10036-8299  
Tel. (212) 969-3246 (direct)  
Fax (212) 969-2900